



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,606	01/18/2005	Safah Bouzar	0687-1001	4929
<div>466 7590 01/06/2010</div> <div>YOUNG & THOMPSON</div> <div>209 Madison Street</div> <div>Suite 500</div> <div>Alexandria, VA 22314</div>				
EXAMINER				
ALLISON, ANDRAE S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2624				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/06/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DocketingDept@young-thompson.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/521,606

Applicant(s)

BOUZAR, SALAH

Examiner

ANDRAE S. ALLISON

Art Unit

2624

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Amendment filed 10/21/2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-22 and 27-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 23-26 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Remarks

1. The Office Action has been made issued in response to amendment filed October 21, 2009. Claims 15-31 are pending. Applicant's arguments have been carefully and respectfully considered in light of the instant amendment, and are not persuasive. Accordingly, this action has been made FINAL.

Claim Objection

Applicant has amended claim 31 by deleting the extra word. Therefore, the objection is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC section § 112

The amendment to claim 17 has not overcome the 112 rejection. Therefore the rejection is not being withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC section § 103

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 15-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claims 15-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 17 recite the limitation, " the method making use of a video camera", however, the bounds of the claim are not definite, since the claim as drafted would imply that their are situation when a camera may not be use, which is not the case. Therefore, the claim is indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 15-21, 27 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liam (WO 01/33503) in view of Bague (US Patent No.: 6,246,933).

(As best understood) As to independent claim 17, Liam discloses a method of detecting an incident on a portion of route (1) situated in a scene (2) (method for detecting traffic incident, column 1, lines 7-10) when said portion of route is suitable for having objects traveling therealong (detection of vehicle of region of interest (ROI) at traffic sites, column 11, lines 1-7), and when the method makes use of a video camera

(3) (1301, see Fig 1) having a target (4) constituting an optoelectronic converter of a real optical image of the scene, said target being controlled by a programmable processor member (6) (image processing unit, see Fig 1), said process for detecting incidents comprising determining in said video camera at least one point selected on a current real image of said scene, outside of said portion of said route, which is approximately at the same position on at least one of a set of immediate previous targets; if not so, coming back to step i); if so, moving to step B) B) having said programmable processor member process said current real images to detect incidents (see page 19, section 5.2.5 and Fig 27 - where a loop is used to detect an incident on chevron (outside of route) or roadway). However, Liam does not teach video camera controllable in one of azimuth, elevation and field of view and having said programmable processing member determine that said video camera is substantially stationary in relation to said scene. It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to include a video camera controllable in one of azimuth, elevation and field of view and having said programmable processing member determine that said video camera is substantially stationary in relation to said scene so that the camera can capture a scene as long as its in the camera range of view and stop the camera one a incident is detected so that the camera can keep the incident in field of view and stabilize the images capture also.

. However, Liam does not expressly disclose an optoelectronic converter of a real optical image of the scene. Bague discloses a method for traffic accident data recording wherein an optoelectronic converter of a real optical image of the scene (see column 14, lines 30-31). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art to modified the method for detecting a traffic incident of Liam with the method for traffic accident data recording for reproducing and reconstructing accident by using traffic information stored in a traffic accident data recorder (column 1, lines 7-14) so that a traffic incident could be reconstructed using real historic data instead of post-accident or estimated data (column 6, lines 5-8).

(As best understood) As to independent claim 31, this claim differs from claim 17 only in that claim 31 is apparatus whereas, claim 17 is method and the limitations a video camera with an optical axis controllable in azimuth, elevation and focal distance and a computer process to detect traffic incidents are additively recited. Bague discloses a computer (21, see Fig 2) process to detect traffic incidents are additively recited. However, Liam in view of Bague does not expressly disclose a video camera with an optical axis controllable in azimuth, elevation and focal distance. However, it would have been obvious to include a video camera with an optical axis controllable in azimuth, elevation and focal distance in the system for detecting traffic incident of Liam as modified by Bague to detect traffic incident at almost any angle or direction and at the same time maintaining good focus.

As to claim 15-16, all the limitations are discussed above except: wherein the real image of the scene begins to move relative to the target occurs upon the beginning of a zooming in function or a zooming out function of the real image and wherein the end of the movement of the real image of the scene relative to the target occurs upon

an end of a zooming in function or a zooming out function of the real image. However, it would have obvious for one skilled in the art to have modified Liam as modified by Bague to wherein the end and beginning of the scene is a function of the zoom so that the camera would be in optimal position and have the proper focus to capture a scene and to quickly and easily determine if there an incident has occurred.

As to claim 18, Liam teaches the method, wherein the programmable processor member is deactivated as soon as the stationarity of the scene relative to the target is detected as ending, and reactivated, in order to implement the process for detecting an incident, as soon as said stationarity of the scene relative to the target is detected as beginning. (note that the vehicle detection window detect the moving vehicle and if the vehicle is not present in the preceding and current frame the vehicle detection window will be in an idle state, see column 21, lines 9-15, also see column 23, lines 1-15, where a stopped vehicle is detected indication a traffic incident).

As to claim 19, Liam teaches the method, characterized in that the beginning and the end of movement of the real image of the scene relative to the target are detected: by determining at least one first image point of said real image of the scene corresponding to a fixed point of said scene; by generating a first command signal when said first image point is subjected to a change of position on said target; and in controlling said programmable processor member as a function of said first command signal (see column 19, lines 14-30, where textual measurement for the region of interest

is computed using matrix elements).

As to claim 20, Liam teaches the method, characterized in that the beginning and the end of movement of the real image of the scene relative to the target are detected: by determining at least second and third image points of said real image of the scene corresponding respectively to two stationary points of said scene; by generating a second command signal when the distance between said second and third image points changes; and by controlling said programmable processor member as a function of the second command signal (see column 19, lines 14-30, where textual measurement for the region of interest is computed using matrix elements).

As to claim 21, Liam teaches the method, characterized in that the beginning and the end of movement of the real image of the scene relative to the target are detected: by determining at least fourth and fifth image points of said real image of the scene which correspond respectively to two stationary points of said scene; by generating a third command signal when the distance between the fourth and fifth image points varies and when at least one of the fourth and fifth image points is subject to a change of position on said target; and by controlling said programmable processor member as a function of the third command signal (see column 19, lines 14-30, where textual measurement for the region of interest is computed using matrix elements).

As to claim 27, Liam teaches the method characterized by the fact that the

beginning and the end of movement of the real image of the scene relative to the target are detected: by determining a plurality of image points of said real image of the scene corresponding to a plurality of points that are stationary at the beginning of movement of the real image; by generating a fourth command signal when a determined number of said plurality of image points have become stationary again at the end of movement of the real image; and by controlling said programmable processor member as a function of said fourth command signal (see column 19, lines 14-30, where textual measurement for the region of interest is computed using matrix elements).

-

5. Claims 22 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liam (PCT/SG99/00115) in view of Bague (US Patent No.: 6,246,933) further in view of Michalopoulos et al (Patent No.: US 4,847,772).

As to claim 22, neither Liam or Bague teach the method, characterized by the fact that it consists in subdividing said target into a plurality of photosensitive points, said photosensitive points being suitable for delivering signals as a function of the quantity of radiation received by their photosensitive surfaces. Michalopoulos discloses a vehicle detection method (column 1, lines 8-10) characterized by the fact that it consists in subdividing said target into a plurality of photosensitive points, said photosensitive points being suitable for delivering signals as a function of the quantity of radiation received by their photosensitive surfaces (see Fig 3, where the image is divided into blocks, also see column 2, lines 55-65). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modified the method for

detecting a traffic incident of Liam as modified by Bague with the vehicle detection method of Michalopoulos to determine vehicle presence, passage, measure various traffic parameters, thus facilitating traffic surveillance (column 1, lines 10-17) by processing selection portion of the successive frames (column 4, lines 30-35).

As to claims 28-30, note the discussion of claim 22 above.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 23-26 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANDRAE S. ALLISON whose telephone number is (571)270-1052. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00 am - 5:00 pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vikram Bali can be reached on (571) 272-7415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/521,606
Art Unit: 2624

Page 11

/WESLEY TUCKER/

/A. S. A./

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2624

Examiner, Art Unit 2624